UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Case No. 08-35653(KRH)

IN RE:

Debtor.

U.S. Courthouse, Suite 4000

701 East Broad Street

CIRCUIT CITY STORES, INC.,

Richmond, VA 23219-1888

December 21, 2009

10:07 a.m.

> TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE KEVIN R. HUENNEKENS UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

McGuireWoods, LLP For the Debtors:

> By: DOUGLAS M. FOLEY, ESQ. SARAH B. BOEHM, ESQ.

World Trade Center

101 West Main Street, Suite 9000

Norfolk, VA 23510-1655

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher and

Flom, LLP

By: IAN S. FREDERICKS, ESQ. One Rodney Square, P.O. Box 636

Wilmington, DE 19899

Electric, Snell

Electric and Boston

Acoustics:

For OmniMount, Denon Sands Anderson, Marks & Miller PC

By: WILLIAM GRAY, ESQ.

801 East Main Street, Suite 1800

Richmond, VA 23218

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service

> J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@optonline.net

(609) 586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

For LumiSource: Williams Mullen

By: ALEX BURNETT, ESQ.

James Center Two 1021 East Cary Street Richmond, VA 23219

Canada:

For Export Development Fullerton and Knowles, PC By: RICHARD HUTSON, ESQ.

12642 Chapel Road Clifton, VA 20124

For Jack Hernandez and Righetti Law Firm

Robert Gentry:

By: JOHN GULGOSKI, ESQ.

456 Montgomery Street, Suite 1400

San Francisco, CA 94104

Ashley Isaac, pro se

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

2

THE COURT DEPUTY: All rise. The United States 2 Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia is now in The Honorable Kevin R. Huennekens presiding. Please session. 4 be seated and come to order.

THE CLERK: In the matter of Circuit City Stores, Incorporated, hearing on Items 1 through 30 as set out on debtor's proposed agenda.

MR. FOLEY: Good morning, Your Honor, Doug Foley with McGuireWoods on behalf of the debtors. With me --

THE COURT: Good morning.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

17

18

19 l

20

21

22

23

MR. FOLEY: Good morning. With me today at counsel 12∥table is Sarah Boehm from my firm, and from the company today is Michelle Mosier, who is the principal financial officer. Your Honor, we have 30 items on the agenda today plus one matter we'd like to bring up at the end of the agenda which we'd like the Court to consider. As Your Honor can tell, most of the matters are being adjourned. But, just to go through them briefly, there's a couple matters we do need the Court to address.

With respect to matter Number 1, this is Waste Management's motion for allowance of late claim. We have resolved the matter. In fact, the Court has actually entered an order resolving the matter. We incorrectly noted that it has been withdrawn. It actually will be withdrawn once the 25 | appeal period expires with respect to the order. So, that one

5 II

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

25

4 will eventually come off of the Court's docket. With respect 2 to Item Number 2, Your Honor, this is our longstanding motion to deal with equity and claims trading. We've been carrying that along with the confirmation hearing. And as Your Honor will see when we get to Item Number 24, at the current point in time, the parties, the committee and the debtors, have agreed to adjourn the hearing on confirmation until January the 28th. So, with respect to Item Number 2, we would like to carry that along with the confirmation hearing date and have that motion heard to the extent confirmation goes forward on the 28th -- on January 28th at 11.

> THE COURT: All right, it will be adjourned.

Your Honor, similarly Items Number 3 and MR. FOLEY: 4, these are the motions by Motorola and General Instruction with respect to the 503(b) claims. They have requested and we have agreed to adjourn their motions until January 28th at 11.

THE COURT: All right, they'll be adjourned.

Your Honor, similarly Item Number 3, this MR. FOLEY: is Sony's motion. We are actually still trying to reconcile with them and we believe we will ultimately reach a resolution. But, at this point, they are prepared to continue their motion until the January 28th hearing date at 11.

23 THE COURT: All right, that will be adjourned as 24 well.

> Your Honor, Items Number 6, which is the MR. FOLEY:

5

7

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Chalifoux motion, seven, which is the Sennheiser motion, Matter 2 Number 9, which is the Vertis motion, Matter Number 10, which is the Towne Square motion, Matter Number 13, which is the 4 Miner Fleet motion, Matter Number 14, which is the Ashley Isaac's motion, all of those motions, Your Honor, we've been carrying along with the confirmation hearing date as they involve requests for allowance of a late filed claim of some priority or another. I believe Ms. Isaac's maybe on the phone, but all of the other parties have agreed to adjourn their motions until the January 28th hearing date at 11.

THE COURT: All right. Which is the one that 12 concerns Ms. Isaac?

MR. FOLEY: Hers is Item Number 14. And we spoke to her last week and told her what we were doing with respect to the late claim motions, and she had agreed at that time to adjourn it. But, at the time we filed the agenda, it was noted as being adjourned until January 28th, but then she called back saying that she wanted to call in and be heard. I don't know if she's on the phone or not.

THE COURT: All right. Is Ms. Isaac on the phone?

MS. ISAAC: Yes, Your Honor, I am.

THE COURT: Do you wish to be heard with regard to her motion? The proposal that has been made in the courtroom is to adjourn this matter to the 28th of January.

MS. ISAAC: Yes, Your Honor, I've decided to go ahead

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

OmniMount motion which has two parts to it. One is to get

allowance of a 503(b)(9) claim. Mr. Gray is here in court

relief from an order that's already been entered as well as an

23

25

7 1 today. They've agreed to carry their motion over to the 2 January 28th hearing date at 11. We are in settlement discussions with them and we hope that we will be able to reach 4 a resolution prior to that date. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gray? MR. GRAY: Good morning, Your Honor, William Gray for

OmniMount. That's correct, we will agree to put it over and continue our settlement negotiations.

THE COURT: All right, very good.

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

That will be continued to the 28th. THE COURT:

MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, Item Number 16 is our motion with respect to Safeco and Bonds. We are working with Safeco 14 as well as the customs and border protection objection, trying to resolve those and see if we can't come to some kind of an agreement. At this time, we're not prepared to go forward with that motion. We'd ask the Court to adjourn it until the 18 January 28th hearing date at 11.

THE COURT: All right, it will be adjourned to the 28th.

MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, Item Number 17 and 18 are the Marblegate motions. We are very close to a resolution with them. At this time, they are only prepared to adjourn their motions until the January 14th date at 2:00 p.m. So, we would 25 ask the Court to carry them over until that date.

All right, those two matters will be THE COURT: carried over to the 14th of January.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, Item Number 19, this is the 4 motion by Booth for relief from the automatic stay. involves an alleged personal injury tort claim. And we have been in discussions with Booth regarding a resolution actually of the underlying claim. They have agreed to adjourn the preliminary hearing on their motion for relief from stay until the January 28th hearing date at 11.

THE COURT: All right, the preliminary hearing will be rescheduled for the 28th of January.

MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, Item Number 20 is the Ryan motion to compel assumption of an agreement. We are discussions with them about trying to get them to withdraw that motion and have the matter dealt with as part of plan confirmation and the plan exhibits. There are two relating to assumption or rejection of executory contracts. And they are considering withdrawing this motion, but they're not prepared to do that as of today. But, they have agreed to adjourn their motion until the January 28th hearing date at 11.

THE COURT: All right, it will be adjourned to the 28th.

MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, Item Number 21, Your Honor, is our procedural motion to further extend the time period in which the debtors may remove actions under 28 U.S.C. Section

5 II

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

1452 and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9027. Your 2 Honor, the new dates that we're asking for in the order are the later of April 5th, 2010 or 30 days after entry of an order 4 terminating the automatic stay with respect to any particular action sought to be removed. There has been no responses or objections to the motion and we would ask the Court to enter an order approving it.

THE COURT: Does any party wish to be heard in connection with the debtor's motion?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Foley, there being no 12 \parallel objection, the Court will grant the motion.

MR. FOLEY: Thank you, Your Honor. If we could skip over Item Number 22 for just a moment, Your Honor, this is the status of the EEC matter and the discovery issues and go through the other items for now?

> THE COURT: You may.

Item Number 23, Your Honor, is the Wind MR. FOLEY: 19 Down Incentive Program. The only party left with respect to that motion, which Your Honor recall from earlier this year, is Jim Marcum, the CEO. Your Honor, we are in discussions and negotiations with the committee and we hope that approval of his compensation in this regard will be consensual. But, in either event, it will be heard on January 14th at two, so we would ask the Court to carry the matter over until that date

and time.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19 l

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right, the matter will be adjourned to the 14th of January. And you say you will be going forward with that then?

MR. FOLEY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Whether it's consensual or whether it's

not?

MR. FOLEY: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FOLEY: Item Number 24, Your Honor, this is again the plan confirmation which we've already filed a notice and served adjourning the confirmation hearing date on the joint plan between the committee and the debtors until January 28th at 11.

THE COURT: All right, and that will be adjourned to the 28th.

MR. FOLEY: Similarly, Your Honor, Items Number 25 and 26, these are the motions by Pioneer and Samsung under Rule 3020 for a deposit relating to confirmation of the plan. They have agreed and we will list it on the agenda prior to the confirmation hearing obviously. As long as it was so listed, they have agreed to carry both of those motions over until the hearing on confirmation, which is currently scheduled for January 28th at 11.

THE COURT: They will be continued to the 28th.

MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, if we could skip Items Number 28 and 29? This is the status hearing on the 19th omnibus objection and the 33rd omnibus objection.

THE COURT: What did we do with Item Number 27?

MR. FOLEY: Twenty-seven, Your Honor, Ms. Boehm is

going to address that shortly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

17

18 II

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay, so we're skipping that over.

MR. FOLEY: If we could, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FOLEY: Item Number 28 and 29, again these are the 19th and 33rd omnibus objections to reclassify certain claims. On Friday evening, Your Honor, we filed a motion for partial summary judgment with respect to several claimants included in those omnibus objections that are asserting administrative priority status relating to reclamation claims for goods that they allegedly delivered between Days 21 and 45 prior to the petition date. The threshold legal issue that we're going to ask the Court to rule on on January 14th at 2:00 p.m. is the issue of whether or not there is an ability to grant administrative claim status for reclamation claim or goods that were delivered between Days 21 and 45 prior to the petition date based upon changes to the statute in BAPCPA in 2005 and the elimination of certain language in the code and the replacement with 503(b)(9).

We have been in discussions with all of the claimants

1 that have made the assertion. They're still entitled to 2 administrative (indiscernible) for that period and we're working on consensual briefing schedules. The parties -- some 4 of the parties have agreed to file their responsive pleadings to the summary judgment motion we filed on Friday by January 11th. We'll file our reply by January 13th and we'll go forward with legal argument only on January 14th only as to those claimants who have asserted this administrative status for goods delivered in this time period. And I believe Mr. Gray is here. He represents several of them, and so does other counsel.

> THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gray?

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. GRAY: Yes. Good morning, again, Your Honor. William Gray for Denin Electric, Snell Electric and Boston Acoustics. Denon and Snell on the 19th, Boston is in the 33rd. I talked to Mr. Foley and I have no problem with what he said, the procedures being set up here.

THE COURT: All right, very good. So, you'll be prepared to argue this on the 14th?

MR. GRAY: Or settle it, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Yes, sir?

MR. BURNETT: Good morning, Your Honor, Alex Burnett on behalf of LumiSource. We're in the 19th objection. just received the motion for summary judgment when it was filed last week and we're taking a look at it. I don't think we have

13 1 any problem with the schedule that counsel has proposed. 2 THE COURT: All right, very good. 3 MR. BURNETT: Thank you. Does any other party wish to be heard in 4 THE COURT: connection with either Item Number 28 or 29 on the Court's 5 6 docket? 7 MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, we've been in contact with 8 Paramount, which is the largest claimant in this category, and they're represented by Klee, Tuchin and Bill Broscious locally, 10 and they're familiar and agreeable to the schedule as well. THE COURT: All right, very good. 12 MR. FOLEY: And we're also dealing with some 13 discovery issues with them as well. 14 THE COURT: All right. So, these two matters we 15 carried over to the 14th. MR. FOLEY: Yes, Your Honor. 16 All right. THE COURT: MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, with respect to Items -- I 18 19 guess that leaves the EDC matter, which is Item Number 22. Your Honor is aware that one is scheduled to go forward on 21 their motion for allowance of a late filed 503(b)(9) claim, and we have some discovery outstanding. At the last hearing, Your 22

11

17

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

Honor ordered the production of two documents to chambers to

review in camera for a decision as to whether or not those

documents can or should be produced to the debtors under a

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

protective order to protect any confidential information that $2 \parallel \text{may exist}$ in there. I believe those two documents were the actual insurance contract itself as well as the application for 4 payment submitted by Techcraft to EDC calling on payment under the insurance contract. And I don't know if the Court has many any decision with respect to review of those documents.

THE COURT: The Court has reviewed the documents. Is counsel for Export Development Canada here?

MR. HUTSON: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning, Your Honor, Richard Hutson on behalf of Export Development Canada. Mr. Clifford is not able to join us on the phone today. So, 12 I'll be arguing on that.

THE COURT: All right. Now, the Court -- I think the documents have been submitted to the Court under seal. we're going to talk specifically about the documents, it would be appropriate to close the courtroom and discuss specifically the documents themselves. And, Mr. Foley, you've not seen the documents, but if we're going to discuss them I think that the record should be sealed with regard to them. So, do you want to take up this matter last or do you want to take it up now?

MR. FOLEY: Under the circumstances, Your Honor, I think it makes sense to take it up last.

> THE COURT: Okay. So, we'll take this up last.

MR. HUTSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 **|**

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, other than that matter, that 2 leaves Items Number 29, which is our 61st omnibus objection, Items Number 60 -- I'm sorry, 30, which is our 60th omnibus objection. And then one matter that Ms. Boehm will be addressing for the Court is a proposed amendment to the case management order that we would like the Court to consider and enter to take effect on January 1st taking into account the new rules on timing of days.

THE COURT: All right, very good.

MS. BOEHM: Good morning, Your Honor, Sarah Boehm on behalf of the debtors. Item 27 on the agenda is the debtor's 16st omnibus objection, which sought the reclassification of certain alleged 503(b)(9) claims to general unsecured nonpriority claims. This objection included two claims for approximately \$180,000 and there were no responses filed. So, we will be submitting an order seeking the reclassification of those claims as set forth in the objection.

> All right, that motion will be granted. THE COURT:

MS. BOEHM: Item 30 on the agenda is the debtor's 60th omnibus objection to claims. This sought the disallowance of certain no liability legal claims, no liability miscellaneous claims and no liability subcontractor claims. Ιt included 48 claims for approximately \$40 million. We did receive ten responses which we will seek to adjourn the status hearing to February 24th at two o'clock. And for any

1 unresponding claimants, we will propose to submit an order 2 | disallowing those claims as set forth in the objection. THE COURT: All right. And then the hearing on the 3 24th of February will be a status conference? 4 5 MS. BOEHM: Status conference, yes. 6 THE COURT: All right, very good. That motion --7 MR. GLUGOSKI: Your Honor, if I maybe heard? I just 8 want to make sure -- this is John Glugoski from Righetti Law Firm on behalf of creditor Jack Hernandez and Robert Gentry as to the 60th objection. We had filed an objection and I just wanted to make sure that that was noted on the record. 11 12 THE COURT: So, you're one of the ten that's being 13 carried over? MR. GLUGOSKI: I believe -- we should be. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay, let me -- Ms. Boehm, is that correct? 16 17 MS. BOEHM: That's correct, Your Honor. They are 18 reflected on Exhibit A to the agenda as being adjourned to February 24th. 19 20 MR. GLUGOSKI: And that's what time again? 21 MS. BOEHM: Two o'clock. 22 MR. GLUGOSKI: Okay. 23 THE COURT: Does any other party wish to be heard in connection with Item Number 30 on the Court's agenda, the

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

debtor's 60th omnibus objection?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 **|**

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Boehm, that motion will be granted.

Thank you, Your Honor. The last item I'd MS. BOEHM: like to address that Mr. Foley referenced is a supplemental order regarding our case management and administrative There was an order entered on the first day of the procedures. case that governed when motions are to be filed, setting them on omnibus hearing, when a response is to be filed. Due to the amended rules that went into effect on December 1st, our order has slightly different dates in it. And in order to avoid confusion with the clerk's office and with other parties, we have proposed amended procedures that comports with the new rules. Basically, instead of submitting things on ten and 20 days prior to omni hearing, it will now be 14 and 21 days with the corresponding calendar day response period as opposed to the business days.

THE COURT: All right. And what kind of notice are 19 you going to be giving to parties in interest in this case of that change?

MS. BOEHM: What we'll do is once the order is entered, I think our procedures say that we will serve the new procedures on the core service list, the 2002 list, file -obviously the order will be filed with the new procedure and it will be posted on KCC with the new procedures. And to the

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 **|**

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

241

25

extent anybody files anything that's not in compliance with that, we'll do what we've always done which is just call them and ask them to either re-notice it or correct it and send them 4 the procedures.

THE COURT: All right, very good. That satisfies the Court's concerns along those lines and the Court will look forward to seeing your order.

> MS. BOEHM: Thank you, Your Honor.

> THE COURT: All right. Mr. Foley?

MR. FOLEY: Your Honor, one matter that we can take up with EDC on the record before we close the record is one item that they provided to us was a privilege log relating to certain email communication. Ad I have a copy of it -- counsel has a copy of it as well -- that I would like to hand up to the Court to consider. The privilege log lists 14 items, 14 documents, and it identifies certain authors and it identifies certain recipients. But, it's unclear to us -- other than obviously Ms. Joanne Keech-Barker who is the affiant to their motion -- whether any of these -- which of these if any of these employees are employees of EDC or whether some of them maybe employees of Techcraft, the insured, or whether they might be employees of the law firm, Blakeley and Blakeley.

The privileged claimed is mostly the Canadian Export Development Act. There is one claiming the attorney-client privilege. Our concern, Your Honor, is only to get at this

8

9

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

1 point any email communications between Techcraft, the insured, 2 and EDC, the insurer, relating to Circuit City from the time 3 period of the petition date, December 10th, until the 503(b)(9) 4 bar date, which was December 19th. And to the extent that 5 there any such responsive email communications in this list, which we can't tell, we would ask that the Court overrule the privilege claim and require that those email communications be produced. THE COURT: So, the concern that you have -- because 10∥you've got the date of the document in here, so you know the dates of the various emails. The concern is whether or not these emails were from Techcraft to the insurer? 12 **|** MR. FOLEY: Yes. THE COURT: And whether or not they concern Circuit 15 City? Right, and the bar --MR. FOLEY: Those are the two issues. THE COURT: MR. FOLEY: And the bar date, right, exactly. THE COURT: Okay. MR. HUTSON: Good morning again, Your Honor. Honor, we --

22 If you would just identify yourself once THE COURT: 23 again. We just need it for the record so --

MR. HUTSON: Richard Hutson on behalf of Export 25 Development Canada.

THE COURT: Thank you.

1

2

6

7

8

10

11

12 **|**

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Sorry, Your Honor. Your Honor, we do MR. HUTSON: believe that these emails are protected by the Export 4 Development Act. However, if Your Honor believes that they $5 \parallel$ still should be produced, we ask that we narrow the scope to exactly as Mr. Foley identifies specifically between the bar date and the petition date, as well as specifically to correspondence referring to the Circuit City case as well. And in addition to that, we'd ask that if we are requested to produce these documents that they be produced under a protective order as well to protect any correspondence that maybe referenced with regard to any other of Export's clients.

THE COURT: All right, so, you don't have any problem as long as there's a protective order in place that would -producing any of the email that would be from Techcraft to the insurer that concerned Circuit City within the specific time frame?

MR. HUTSON: That's correct, Your Honor.

All right. THE COURT:

MR. HUTSON: And the protective order would protect if there's any references at all to any other of Export's clients in those correspondence at all that somehow are mixed in there.

THE COURT: And the protective order would just say 25 that that remains privileged --

MR. HUTSON: Remains privileged. 1 2 THE COURT: -- and that nobody can use it without the 3 Court's --MR. HUTSON: Exactly right, in case there's any 4 5 references. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Foley, is that acceptable to 7 the debtor? 8 MR. FOLEY: Absolutely. That's fine, Your Honor. And obviously the protective order, to the extent whatever Your 10 Honor rules with respect to the other two documents that we're going to go in camera on, the same protection would apply to 11 12 whatever documents they produce here. THE COURT: All right. So, that's what the Court 13 will order then, that it be produced subject to the protective 15 order as counsel has stated on the record. MR. HUTSON: And just to clarify, Your Honor, and now 16 17 the -- to a narrowed scope between the petition date and the 18 bar date. 19 THE COURT: Yes, that's what I'm saying. That's what both of you said and that's what I'm order. Okay? 21 MR. HUTSON: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: So, that takes us up to the very last 23 item, which then is going to be the sealed document?

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

THE COURT: All right. So, then I would ask all

MR. FOLEY: Yes, Your Honor.

24

25

1 parties then other than the debtor and Export Development 2 Canada to please the courtroom and ask the court security 3 officer to seal the courtroom so that we can take this matter 4 up. 5 MR. FREDERICKS: Your Honor, this is Ian Fredericks 6 of Skadden Arps. I just -- Your Honor may want to drop the 7 line as well, which I'm certainly fine having done. 8 THE COURT: Yes, we're going to do that next, but 9 thank you very much. Is there anybody that's on the line 10 specifically with Export Development Canada? 11 (No verbal response) 12 THE COURT: Okay, very good. So, I'm going to close the telephone line at this point. All right. So, the call has 13 been dropped? 14 15 THE CLERK: Yes. THE COURT: All right. 16 17 (In camera hearing begins) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

<u>CERTIFICATION</u>

I, CARLA M. OAKLEY, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and to the best of my ability.

/s/ Carla M. Oakley

CARLA M. OAKLEY

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: January 24, 2010